arXiv:1608.06210v1 [math.GN] 12 Aug 2016

σ-IDEALS AND OUTER MEASURES ON THE REAL LINE

S. GACÍA-FERREIRA, A. H. TOMITA, AND Y. F. ORTIZ-CASTILLO

Abstract. A *weak selection* on $\mathbb{R}$ is a function $f : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\{x, y\}) \in \{x, y\}$ for each $\{x, y\} \in [\mathbb{R}]^2$. In this article, we continue with the study (which was initiated in [1]) of the outer measures λ_f on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ defined by weak selections f. One of the main results is to show that CH is equivalent to the existence of a weak selection f for which:

$$\lambda_f(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |A| \leq \omega, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Some conditions are given for a σ-ideal of $\mathbb{R}$ in order to be exactly the family $\mathcal{N}_f$ of λ_f-null subsets for some weak selection f. It is shown that there are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ pairwise distinct ideals on $\mathbb{R}$ of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$, where f is a weak selection. Also we prove that Martin Axiom implies the existence of a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f$ is exactly the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. Finally, we shall study pairs of weak selections which are "almost equal" but they have different families of λ_f-measurable sets.

Preliminaries and Introduction

For an infinite set X and a cardinal number κ, we let $[X]^{\kappa} = \{F \subseteq X : |F| = \kappa\}$ and similarly we define $[X]^{\leq\kappa}$ and $[X]^{\geq\kappa}$. The cardinality of the real line shall be denoted by $\mathfrak{c}$. The letters α, β, γ, η, ξ and ζ will represent ordinal numbers. The Greek letter ω stands for the first infinite cardinal number and ω_1 stands for the first uncountable cardinal number. Given a fixed ordinal α, (β, η), $[\beta, \eta)$, $(\beta, \eta]$ and $[\beta, \eta]$ will denote the interval of α with respect to the order of α for each $\beta < \eta < \alpha$. The usual order on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ will be simply denoted by $\leq$.

A function $f : [X]^2 \to X$ is called a *weak selection* if $f(F) \in F$ for all $F \in [X]^2$. The most common example of a weak selection on the real line is the Euclidean weak selection $f_E : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $f_E(\{x, y\}) = x$ iff $x < y$, for all $\{x, y\} \in [\mathbb{R}]^2$. For a given weak selection f on X, we say that a point $x \in X$ is *f-minimum* if $f\big(\{x, y\}\big) = x$ for every $y \in X$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A12, 28A99, secondary 28B15.

Key words and phrases. Lebesgue outer measures, outer measures, weak selections, $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence between weak selections, congruence between weak selections, null-ideals of outer measures, σ-ideals.

Research of the first-named author was supported by CONACYT grant no. 176202 and PAPIIT grant no. IN-101911. The second author has support from FAPESP (Brazil) Proc. 2014/16955-2. The third author has support from CNPq (Brazil) - "Bolsa de Produtividade em Pesquisa, processo 307130/2013-4", CNPq Universal 483734/2013-6.

For a weak selection $f : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\{x, y\} \in [\mathbb{R}]^2$, we say $x <_f y$ if $f(\{x, y\}) = x$, and for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $x \leq_f y$ if either $x <_f y$ or $x = y$. This relation $\leq_f$ is reflexive, antisymmetric and linear, but not transitive. If f is a weak selection and $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$, then the f-intervals are denoted by $(r, s)_f := \Big\{x \in X : r <_f x <_f s\Big\}$, $(r, s]_f := \Big\{x \in X : r <_f x \leq_f s\Big\}$, $(r, \to)_f := \Big\{x \in X : r <_f x\Big\}$ etc. For the Euclidean intervals we just write (r, s), $(r, s]$, $(r, \to)$ etc. In the notation (r, s) we shall understand that $r < s$. Meanwhile, in the general notation $(r, s)_f$ we do not necessarily require that $r <_f s$.

The weak selections have been studied by several mathematicians in the areas of Topology and Analysis (see for instance [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [9], [8] and [10]). One important property of the weak selections is that they give the possibility to generates topologies which have interesting topological properties (see [3], [6] and [9]). In the article [1], the authors introduced the notion of f-outer measure by using a weak selection f on the real line as follows:

If $f : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a weak selection and $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then we define

$$\lambda_f(A) := \inf\Big\{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n - r_n| : A \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n, s_n]_f\Big\},$$

if A can be cover for a countable family of semi-open f-intervals, and $\lambda_f(A) = +\infty$ otherwise. This function $\lambda_f : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is an outer measure on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ which generalizes the Lebesgue outer measure. Certainly, the Lebesgue outer measure λ coincides with the outer measure λ_{f_E} (briefly denoted by λ) where f_E is the weak selection induced by the Euclidean order of $\mathbb{R}$. Given a weak selection f on $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{N}_f$ will denote the σ-ideal consisting of all λ_f-null sets and the family of λ_f-measurable subsets will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}_f$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}$ will stand for the family of Lebesgue measurable sets, and $\mathcal{N}$ for the Lebesgue null subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. Since the null sets of an outer measure form an σ-ideal, it is very natural to consider the following question.

Question 0.1. *What are the σ-ideals I on $\mathbb{R}$ for which there is a weak selection f such that $I = \mathcal{N}_f$?*

A particular case of this question is the following.

Question 0.2. *Is there a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f$ is exactly the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$?*

In the first section, we will see that there are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ many pairwise distinct ideals of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$, where f is a weak selection on $\mathbb{R}$. An example of a σ-ideal on $\mathbb{R}$ which is not of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$ for any weak selection f is described. Some conditions on σ-ideals are given in order be of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$ for some weak selection f. In the second section, we show that CH

is equivalent several conditions involving a very spacial weak selections on $\mathbb{R}$. In the third section, we use Martin Axiom to show the existence of a weak selection f for which $\mathcal{N}_f$ is precisely the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. The last section is devoted to study pairs of weak selections which are similar modulo a set but their induced measures have different families of measurable sets.

1. $\mathcal{N}_f$-IDEALS

First, let us construct $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ many pairwise distinct ideals of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$, where f is a weak selection on $\mathbb{R}$. The construction is based on the following theorem.

We recall the definition of the direct sum of two ideals $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$:

$$\mathcal{I} \oplus \mathcal{J} = \{I \cup J : I \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } J \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

It is easy to show that if $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are two σ-ideals, then $\mathcal{I} \oplus \mathcal{J}$ is a σ-ideal too.

The following easy lemma has been frequently used to construct examples and counterexamples (see for instance [1]).

Lemma 1.1. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let f be a weak selection on $\mathbb{R}$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to x, in the Euclidean topology, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ either $x <_f a <_f x_n$ or $x_n <_f a <_f x$, for every $a \in A$ (but at most a countable subset). Then $\lambda_f(A) = 0$.*

Theorem 1.2. *For every $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and for every weak selection f without minimum, there is a weak selection g such that*

$$\mathcal{N}_f \oplus \mathcal{P}(X) = \mathcal{N}_g.$$

Proof. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let f be a weak selection. If $|\mathbb{R}\setminus X| \leq \omega$, by Corollary 2.7 from [1], then we obtain that $\mathcal{N}_f \oplus \mathcal{P}(X) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, and Example 3.6 from [1] provides a weak selection g such that $\mathcal{N}_g = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, we will suppose that $|\mathbb{R}\setminus X| > \omega$. Fix a non-trivial sequence $\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}\setminus X$ converging to a point $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus X$. Now, define the weak selection g by:

$$g(\{r,s\}) = \begin{cases} r & r = x \text{ and } s \in X, \\ s & r = x_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } s \in X, \\ f(\{r,s\}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Assume, without loss of generality, that g does not have a minimum (otherwise, we modify the function by making simple changes). We assert that g satisfies the requirements. To show that it suffices to prove the equivalence $\lambda_g(Y) = 0$ iff $Y = A \cup B$ for some $A \subseteq X$ and $B \in \mathcal{N}_f$. This equivalence will follow from the next claim.

Claim 1: Given $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus X$, we have that $\lambda_g(Y) = 0$ iff $\lambda_f(Y) = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1: Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus X$. From the definition of g it is evident that $g(\{r,s\}) = f(\{r,s\})$ whenever $r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus X$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, $\lambda_f(Y) = 0$ iff for every positive $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $\{r_n^k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\{s_n^k : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$Y \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_f \text{ and } \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k},$$

which is equivalent to say that for every positive $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $\{r_n^k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\{s_n^k : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$Y \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_g \text{ and } \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k}.$$

Clearly, this last statement is equivalent to $\lambda_g(Y) = 0$. And the claim is proved.

Now pick $A \subseteq X$ and $B \in \mathcal{N}_f$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $B \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus X$. By the definition of g and Lemma 1.1, we have that $\lambda_g(A) = 0$. Also by Claim 1, $\lambda_g(B) = 0$ and then $\lambda_g(A \cup B) = 0$. On the other hand, if $\lambda_g(Y) = 0$, then $\lambda_g(Y \setminus X) = 0$. Thus by Claim 1, $Y \setminus X \in \mathcal{N}_f$. The proof is done because of $Y = (Y \cap X) \cup (Y \setminus X)$. □

Corollary 1.3. *There are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ pairwise distinct σ-ideals of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$.*

Proof. Consider the σ-ideal of the Lebesgue null sets $\mathcal{N}$. By Theorem 1.2, we know that for every $A \notin \mathcal{N}$ there is a weak selection g such that $\mathcal{N}_g = \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{P}(A)$. It is then clear that we can find $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$-many subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ which are not in $\mathcal{N}$. We know that these sets induce distinct σ-ideals of the form $\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{P}(A)$. □

Corollary 1.4. *The following statements are equivalents:*

1. *There exists a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}$.*
2. *For every $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ there is a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega} \oplus \mathcal{P}(X)$.*

Proof. The implication (1) ⇒ (2) follows from Lemma 1.2 and (2) ⇒ (1) is trivial by putting $X = \emptyset$. □

The previous corollary suggests the following question.

Question 1.5. *Assume that there is $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathbb{R} \setminus X| = \mathfrak{c}$ and a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega} \oplus \mathcal{P}(X)$. Under this assumption, is it true that there exists a weak selection g such that $\mathcal{N}_g = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}$?*

Now we shall give some σ-ideals on $\mathbb{R}$ which are not of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$ for any weak selection f. To have this done we need to recall that the *cofinality* of an ideal $\mathcal{I}$, denoted by $cf(\mathcal{I})$, is the least cardinality of a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ there is $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $I \subseteq B$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a nonempty family of nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, then

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \subseteq \mathbb{R} : X \subseteq \cup\mathcal{A}' \text{ for some } \mathcal{A}' \in [\mathcal{A}]^{\leq\omega} \cup [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}\}$$

will denote the *σ-ideal generated* by $\mathcal{A}$. Observe that $cf(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})) \leq |\mathcal{A}|$ for every nonempty family $\mathcal{A}$ of nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{R}$

The following result is well-known, but we would like to include a proof of it.

Lemma 1.6. *For every weak selection f, $cf(\mathcal{N}_f) \leq \mathfrak{c}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the family of all subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ of the form:

$$\bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \Big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_f \Big), \text{ where } \{(r_n^k, s_n^k]_f : n, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \text{ satisfies}$$

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since there are only $\mathfrak{c}$-many pairwise different f-intervals, we must have that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \mathfrak{c}$. By the definition of λ_f it is evident that $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. □

Given an infinite cardinal number κ, an infinite family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [X]^\kappa$ on an infinite set X is called *κ-almost disjoint*, for short $\kappa - AD$-family, if $|A \cap B| < \kappa$ for distinct A, $B \in \mathcal{A}$. Notice that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\kappa - AD$-family on $\mathbb{R}$ and $cf(\kappa) > \omega$, then $cf(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})) = |\mathcal{A}|$.

Example 1.7. Let κ be the least cardinal such that $\mathfrak{c}^\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$. Then we have that $\omega_1 \leq \kappa \leq \mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{c}^{<\kappa} = \mathfrak{c}$. Identified $\mathbb{R}$ with $\mathfrak{c}^{<\kappa}$. Then, for each $s \in \mathfrak{c}^\kappa$ define $A_s = \{s|_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}^{<\kappa}$. Consider the σ-ideal $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ on $\mathfrak{c}^{<\kappa}$ generated by the family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_s : s \in \mathfrak{c}^\kappa\}$. Since $cf(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})) \geq |\mathcal{A}| = \mathfrak{c}^\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$, we must have that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \mathcal{N}_f$ for every weak selection f.

It is clear that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a maximal $\mathfrak{c}-AD$-family on $\mathbb{R}$, then $cf(\mathfrak{c}) < |\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^\mathfrak{c}$. Hence, if $\mathfrak{c}$ is regular and $\mathcal{A}$ is a maximal $\mathfrak{c}-AD$-family on $\mathbb{R}$, then $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \mathcal{N}_f$ for every weak selection f

Consider the σ-ideal $\mathcal{J}$ of non-stationary subsets of $\mathfrak{c}$. If $\mathfrak{c}$ is regular, then we know that $cf(\mathcal{J}) > \mathfrak{c}$ and hence $\mathcal{J} \neq \mathcal{N}_f$ for every weak selection f.

The next question seems to be very natural.

Question 1.8. *Given an arbitrary family $\mathcal{A}$ of infinite subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ of size $\mathfrak{c}$, is there a model of ZFC in which $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{N}_f$ for some weak selection f?*

The answer to Question 1.8 is affirmative under CH as it will be shown in Theorem 2.9.

Next, we shall study the ideals of the form $[\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ where $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. The following theorem will provide some conditions which guarantee that the σ-ideal $[\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ is of the form $\mathcal{N}_f$. First, we prove some preliminary results.

Lemma 1.9. *For every weak selection f and for every infinite set $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ there is a weak selection g such that D does not have g-minimum and*

$$|\big((r, s]_f \setminus (r, s]_g\big) \cup \big((r, s]_g \setminus (r, s]_f\big)| \leq \omega$$

for each r, $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Suppose that d is the f-minimum inside of D. Take a countable infinite subset $N \subseteq D$ which contains d. Enumerate N as $\{r_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $d = r_0$. The weak selection g is defined as follows:

$g(\{r_n, r_m\}) = r_n$ whenever that $n > m$ and g is equal to f on the other pairs of points.

It is evident that D does not have a g-minimum and since g is equal to f except for a countable subset, the second property holds. □

Let α be an ordinal number of cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$ and let $\phi : [0, \alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bijection. Then, we transfer the order of α to $\mathbb{R}$ by using ϕ and we define the weak selection f_ϕ on $\mathbb{R}$ by the rule $f_\phi(\{r, s\}) = r$ iff $\phi^{-1}(r) <_\alpha \phi^{-1}(s)$. When the characteristics of the bijection ϕ is not relevant we will simply denote by f_α the corresponding weak selection.

Lemma 1.10. *Let $f_\mathfrak{c}$ be a weak selection induced by a bijection $\phi : [0, \mathfrak{c}) \to \mathbb{R}$. Then the following statements are equivalent for every set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.*

(1) $\lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}(A) = 0$,
(2) $\lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}(A) < \infty$, *and*
(3) *there is $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a \leq_{f_\mathfrak{c}} r$ for all $a \in A$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $A \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\phi(0)\}$ since $\lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}(\{\phi(0)\}) = 0$. The implication (1) ⇒ (2) is evident.

(2) ⇒ (3). Since $\lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}(A) < \infty$ there is a family $\big\{\{a_n, b_n\} : n,\ m \in \mathbb{N}\big\} \subseteq [\mathbb{R}]^2$ such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} (a_n, b_n]_{f_\mathfrak{c}}$. Let $\xi = sup\{\phi^{-1}(b_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. As $\phi^{-1}[A] \subseteq [0, \xi]$, we obtain that $a \leq_{f_\mathfrak{c}} \phi(\xi)$ for all $a \in A$.

(3) ⇒ (1). Since $|A| < \mathfrak{c}$ we can find a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ convergent to $\phi(0)$ such that $\phi^{-1}(x_n) > \phi^{-1}(r)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $A \subseteq (\phi(0), x_n]_{f_\mathfrak{c}}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 1.1, $\lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}(A) = 0$. □

We remark that Lemma 1.10 could fail for ordinals greater than $\mathfrak{c}$. For an example we may consider the ordinal $\mathfrak{c} + 1$ and any bijection $\phi : [0, \mathfrak{c}] \to \mathbb{R}$. Following similar arguments to the implication (3) ⇒ (1), we may choose a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ convergent to $\phi(\mathfrak{c})$. Set $A = \{r \in \mathbb{R} : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}(x_n <_{f_\phi} r)\}$ and observe that $|A| = \mathfrak{c}$ and $\lambda_{f_\phi}(A) = 0$. Hence, we deduce that if there is $A \in \mathcal{N}_{f_\alpha} \cap [\mathbb{R}]^\mathfrak{c}$, then $\mathfrak{c} < \alpha$.

Theorem 1.11. **[$\mathfrak{c}$ is regular]** *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ such that:*

(i) $|\mathbb{R} \setminus \big(\bigcup_{\eta<\xi} A_\eta\big)| = \mathfrak{c}$ *for every* $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$, *and*
(ii) $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{\xi<\mathfrak{c}} A_\xi$.

Then there is a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathfrak{c}$ is regular. Enumerate $[\mathfrak{c}]^\omega$ as $\{N_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ and set $B_\xi = \bigcup_{\eta\in N_\xi} A_\eta$ for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$. By using the following fact:

every uncountable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ contains a nontrivial convergent sequence and its limit point,

for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ we can find $x_\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and a nontrivial sequence S_ξ of $\mathbb{R}$ so that:

(1) S_ξ converges to x_ξ,
(2) $x_\xi \notin S_\xi$, and
(3) $\big[B_\xi \cup \big(\bigcup_{\eta<\xi}(B_\eta \cup S_\eta \cup \{x_\eta\})\big)\big] \cap \big(S_\xi \cup \{x_\xi\}\big) = \emptyset$.

Let us define the weak selection f as follows:

$$f(\{r,s\}) = \begin{cases} s & r \in B_\xi \text{ and } s \in S_\xi, \text{ for some } \xi < \mathfrak{c}, \\ r & r \in B_\xi \text{ and } s = x_\xi, \text{ for some } \xi < \mathfrak{c}, \\ f_{\mathfrak{c}}(\{r,s\}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

First, we prove that $\mathcal{N}_f \subseteq [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. Let $M \in \mathcal{N}_f$. Then there is a countable family of f-intervals $\{(r_n^k, s_n^k]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that

$$M \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_f \text{ and } \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{\eta<\mathfrak{c}} A_\eta$, there is $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ such that

$$\{r_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{s_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq B_\xi.$$

Let $M' = M \setminus \big(B_\xi \cup \{x_\xi\} \cup S_\xi\big)$. By the definition of f, we know that $f(\{x,y\}) = f_{\mathfrak{c}}(\{x,y\})$ for every $x \in B_\xi \cup \{x_\xi\} \cup S_\xi$ and every$y \in M'$. Hence, $M' \subseteq \bigcup_{n,k\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n^k, s_n^k]_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}}$ and so $\phi^{-1}(M') \subseteq [0,s]$, where $s = sup\{s_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which implies that $|M'| < \mathfrak{c}$. This shows that $\mathcal{N}_f \subseteq [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. On the other hand, it is evident that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_f$. Fix $L \in [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}}$. By applying Lemma 1.10 and the regularity of $\mathfrak{c}$, we have that $\lambda_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}}(L) = 0$. As above, choose a countable family of real numbers $\{r_n^k, s_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that

$$L \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}} \text{ and } \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\zeta < \mathfrak{c}$ be such that $\{r_n^k, s_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq B_\zeta$. Consider the set $L' = L \setminus \big(B_\zeta \cup \{x_\zeta\} \cup S_\zeta\big)$. Observe that $f(\{x,y\}) = f_{\mathfrak{c}}(\{x,y\})$ for every $x \in B_\zeta \cup \{x_\zeta\} \cup S_\zeta$ and every $y \in L'$. This implies that $L' \subseteq \bigcup_{n,k\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n^k, s_n^k]_f$ and so $L' \in \mathcal{N}_f$ and hence $L \in \mathcal{N}_f$. Thus, $[\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq N_f$. □

The following question is somehow related to Theorem 1.2.

Question 1.12. *Given two weak selection f and g without minimum, is there a weak selection h such that*

$$\mathcal{N}_f \oplus \mathcal{N}_g = \mathcal{N}_h?$$

In the next section, we will see that the previous question has a positive answer under CH.

We remark that there are σ-ideals on $\mathbb{R}$ which are not of the form $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{A}$ for a $\mathfrak{c}$-AD-family $\mathcal{A}$. For instance the σ-ideal of meager subsets of the real line. This ideal will be consider in the next sections.

2. $\mathcal{N}_f$-ideals under CH

Let us consider in this section the trivial measure on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by:

$$\mu(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |A| \leq \omega, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is evident from Lemma 1.10 that CH implies that $\lambda_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}} = \mu$ and so $\mathcal{N}_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}} = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}$. In the next theorem, we will show that CH is equivalent to the existence of a weak selection f for which $\lambda_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}} = \mu$. This theorem will be a consequence of the following lemmas.

Definition 2.1. Let $\alpha \leq \mathfrak{c}$ be an ordinal number. We say that a weak selection f *generates an α-ordered set* if there is an indexed subset $\{r_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that either $r_\beta <_f r_\gamma$ whenever $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$, or $r_\gamma <_f r_\beta$ whenever $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$.

Given $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and a weak selection f, we set

$$L(r)_f^X = (\leftarrow, r)_f \cap X \text{ and } R(r)_f^X = (r, \rightarrow)_f \cap X.$$

In particular, we have that $L(r)_f^{\mathbb{R}} = (\leftarrow, r)_f$ and $R(r)_f^{\mathbb{R}} = (r, \rightarrow)_f$ for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that f is a weak selection on $\mathbb{R}$ for which there exist $X \in [\mathbb{R}]^{\geq\omega_2}$ and $Y \in [X]^{\geq\omega_2}$ such that, for each $r \in Y$, we have that either $|L(r)_f^X| \leq \omega_1$ or $|R(r)_f^X| \leq \omega_1$. Then f generates an ω_2-orderer set in Y.*

Proof. Assume that f, X and Y satisfy the hypothesis. Without loss of generality we may assume that $|L(r)_f^X| \leq \omega_1$ for each $r \in Y$, the case when $|R(r)_f^X| \leq \omega_1$ for each $r \in Y$, is managed analogously. We will find recursively the points of the ω_2-ordered set. Pick $r_0 \in Y$ arbitrarily. Of course the set $\{r_0\}$ is an 1-ordered set in Y. Let $\alpha < \omega_2$ and assume that, for each $\beta < \alpha$, a real number $r_\beta \in Y$ has been chosen such that $r_\gamma < r_\beta$ whenever $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$. By hypothesis, we know that the set $X_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} L(r_\beta)_f^X$ has cardinality at most ω_1. As $|Y| \geq \omega_2$, we may find $r_\alpha \in Y \setminus X_\alpha$. It is then clear that $r_\beta < r_\alpha$ for each $\beta < \alpha$ and hence the set $\{r_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\}$ is an $(\alpha+1)$-ordered set. By continuing this construction, we obtain a set $B = \{r_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ which is an ω_2-ordered set in Y. □

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $\mathfrak{c} \geq \omega_2$. If f is a weak selection which generates an ω_2-ordered set A in $\mathbb{R}$, then A contains subset X of size ω_1 such that $\lambda_f(X) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $A = \{r_\xi : \xi < \omega_2\}$ be the ω_2-ordered set generated by f. Without loss of generality, assume that A does not have isolated points, in the Euclidean topology, and that $r_\xi <_f r_\zeta$ provided that $\xi < \zeta < \omega_2$, the other case is analogous. Since A is separable in the Euclidean topology, we can choose a subset $I \in [\omega_2]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $\{r_\xi : \xi \in I\}$ is dense in A. Set $\beta = \min\{I\}$ and $\gamma = \sup\{I\}$. Then we have that $I \subseteq [\beta, \gamma]$ and

hence $|[\beta,\gamma]| = \omega_1$. Our required set is $X = \{r_\xi : \xi \in (\beta,\gamma]\}$. Indeed, since A is an ω_2-ordered set, $X \subseteq (r_\beta, r_\gamma]_f$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. As the set $\{r_\xi : \xi \in I\}$ is dense in X, we can choose ξ_1 as the least $\xi \in [\beta,\gamma)$ such that $|r_\xi - r_\gamma| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By using this process finitely many times we can find a finite set $\{\xi_i : i \leq l\} \subseteq I \cup \{\beta,\gamma\}$ such that $\gamma = \xi_0$, $\beta = \xi_l$, $X \subseteq \bigcup_{i<l}(r_{\xi_i}, r_{\xi_{i+1}}]_f$ and $|r_{\xi_{i+1}} - r_{\xi_i}| < \frac{\epsilon}{2^{i+1}}$, for each $i < l$. Then, we obtain that $\lambda_f(X) \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, the λ_f-outer measure of X is equal to 0. □

Lemma 2.4. *For every $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and for every weak selection f, either:*
(i) X contains a subset of size ω_1 and zero λ_f-outer measure, or
(ii) $\{a \in X : |L(a)_f^X| \leq \omega_1$ or $|R(a)_f^X| \leq \omega_1\}$ has cardinality at most ω_1.

Proof. It is evident that, if $|X| \leq \omega_1$, then *(ii)* holds. Assume that $|X| > \omega_1$ and suppose, without loss of generality, that $A = \{a \in X : |L(a)_f^X| \leq \omega_1\}$ has cardinality at least ω_2. By Lemma 2.2, f generates an ω_2-ordered set contained in A. Hence, by Lemma 2.3, A contains a subset of size ω_1 and λ_f-outer measure 0. □

The next lemma follows directly from Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6 of [1].

Lemma 2.5. *For every weak selection f and for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we have that:*

$$\lambda_f(\{r\}) = \begin{cases} 0 & r \text{ is not } f\text{-minimum} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We are ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.6. *The following statements are equivalent:*
(1) *CH*
(2) *There is a weak selection f such that $|(\leftarrow, r)_f| \leq \omega$ for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(3) *There is a weak selection f such that $|(r, \rightarrow)_f| \leq \omega$ for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(4) *There is a weak selection f such that every f-interval $(r,s]_f$ is countable for each r, $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(5) *There is a weak selection f and a subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $|D| = \mathfrak{c}$ and $|(r,s]_f \cap D| \leq \omega$ for every r, $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(6) *There is a weak selection f such that, $\lambda_f = \mu$.*

Proof. For the implication (1) ⇒ (2) we use the weak selection $f_{\mathfrak{c}} = f_{\omega_1}$. For the implications (2) ⇒ (3) we consider the opposite weak selection $\hat{f}$ of f which is defined by $\hat{f}(\{x,y\}) = y$ iff $f(\{x,y\}) = x$. The implications (3) ⇒ (4) and (4) ⇒ (5) are straightforward.

(5) ⇒ (6). Let f be a weak selection and let D be a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ which satisfy the conditions required by (5). By Lemma 1.9, without loss of generality, we may assume that D does not have f-minimum. Fix a bijection $\phi : D \to \mathbb{R}$. Define the weak selection $g : [\mathbb{R}]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by the rule: $\phi(r) <_g \phi(s)$ iff $r <_f s$. Then the following conditions hold:

(i) all the g-intervals are countable and

(ii) there is not a g-minimum.
Clause (i) implies that $\lambda_g(A) = \infty$ for every uncountable $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and, by (ii) and Lemma 2.5, $\lambda_g(A) = 0$ for every $A \in [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}$.

(6) $\Rightarrow$ (4). Let f a weak selection such that $\lambda_f = \mu$. Suppose that there are two real numbers r and s such that $|(r,s]_f| > \omega$. Then $(r,s]_f \notin \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_f}$, but $\mu\big((r,s]_f\big) = \lambda_f\big((r,s]_f\big) \leq |s-r| < \infty$ which is impossible.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let f be a weak selection such that every f-interval of the form $(r,s]_f$ is countable. Fix $A \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_f}$. Then there is a countable family of ordered pairs

$$\{(r_n, s_n) : r_n,\ s_n \in \mathbb{R},\ \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n, s_n]_f$. Thus $|A| \leq \omega$. This shows that $\mathbb{R}$ does not have an uncountable subset of zero f-outer measure. Now, assume the negation of CH. Then, by Lemma 2.4, we must have that

$$|\{r \in \mathbb{R} : |(\leftarrow, r)_f| \leq \omega_1 \text{ or } |(r, \rightarrow)_f| \leq \omega_1\}| \leq \omega_1.$$

Then, there is a real number a such that $|(a,\rightarrow)_f| \geq \omega_2$. By applying again the same lemma to the set $(a,\rightarrow)_f$ we obtain

$$|\{r \in (a,\rightarrow)_f : |L(r)_f^{(a,\rightarrow)_f}| \leq \omega_1 \text{ or } |R(r)_f^{(a,\rightarrow)_f}| \leq \omega_1\}| \leq \omega_1.$$

Thus there is $b \in (a,\rightarrow)_f$ such that $|L(b)_f^{(a,\rightarrow)_f}| \geq \omega_2$. As $L(b)_f^{(a,\rightarrow)_f} \subseteq (a,b]_f$, $|(a,b]_f| \geq \omega_2$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, the CH holds. □

Base on the results already established , we shall say that a weak selection f satisfies the *countable null condition (c.n.c.)* if $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega}$.

Corollary 2.7. *[CH] There is a weak selection f which satisfies the c.n.c..*

In connection with the last corollary, we shall consider the following statement.

CNH (*Countable Null Hypothesis*): There is a weak selection f on $\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies de *c.n.c.*

We are unable to answer the following question.

Question 2.8. *Is CNH equivalent to CH?*

Under CH the σ-ideals with cofinallity $\leq \mathfrak{c}$ may be characterized as follows.

Theorem 2.9. [CH] *If $\mathcal{I}$ is a σ-ideal on $\mathbb{R}$ with $cf(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{c}$, then there is a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. . Suppose CH and let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ that generates the σ-ideal $\mathcal{I}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $|\mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{\eta<\xi} A_\xi| = \omega_1$ for every $\xi < \omega_1$. In the opposite, we have that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, for this case the weak selection defined in Example 3.6 from [1] does the job. Then, we have that the family $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies conditions

(i)-(ii) from Theorem 1.11, then, there exists a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq\omega} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{I}$. □

Corollary 2.10. **[CH]** *There exists a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f$ is exactly the σ-ideal of of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. . The statement follows from the fact that the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ is generated by the family of all nowhere dense closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ which has size $\mathfrak{c}$. □

Corollary 2.11. **[CH]** *For every pair of weak selections f and g there is a weak selection h such that $\mathcal{N}_h = \mathcal{N}_f \oplus \mathcal{N}_g$.*

3. $\mathcal{N}_f$-IDEALS UNDER MA

It is well known that, under Martin Axiom, either the union of $< \mathfrak{c}$ meager sets is meager, and the union of $< \mathfrak{c}$ Lebesgue measure zero sets has measure 0. However, this is not the case for our outer measures that we have considered so far. Indeed, let $\mathcal{A}$ a partition of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| = \omega_1$ and $|A| = \mathfrak{c}$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By using some ideas from the proof of Theorem 1.11 and the weak selection $f_{\mathfrak{c}}$, we can find a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathbb{N}^{\leq\omega} \oplus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbb{R} \notin \mathcal{N}_f$. Hence, in a model of $MA + \neg CH$ this σ-ideal $\mathcal{N}_f$ is not closed under $< \mathfrak{c}$ unions.

Recall that an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ is a $< \mathfrak{c}$-*ideal* if it is closed under unions of subfamilies of size $< \mathfrak{c}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a proper $< \mathfrak{c}$-ideal of $\mathbb{R}$ containing $\mathbb{R}^{<\mathfrak{c}}$ with $cf(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{c}$. Then there is a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ generates the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. By transfinite induction, for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$, we will define points x_ξ and sets S_ξ and X_ξ such that:

(1) S_ξ is a nontrivial sequence converging to x_ξ for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$,
(2) $X_0 = A_0$, $X_\xi = \left(\bigcup_{\eta<\xi} X_\eta\right) \cup A_\xi$ if $0 < \xi < \mathfrak{c}$ is limit and $X_{\xi+1} = X_\xi \cup A_{\xi+1} \cup S_\xi \cup \{x_\xi\}$ for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$, and
(3) $S_\xi \cup x_\xi \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(A_\xi \cup \left(\bigcup_{\eta<\xi} X_\eta\right)\right)$ for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$.
(4) $|X_\xi \setminus \bigcup_{\eta\leq\xi+1} A_\eta| < \mathfrak{c}$ for each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$.

Then, the first stage is determined by (1)-(3). Let $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ and suppose that we have defined the points x_η and the sets S_η and X_η for every $\eta < \xi$ satisfying (1)-(3). Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a proper $< \mathfrak{c}$-ideal containing $\mathbb{R}^{<\mathfrak{c}}$, we have that $|\mathbb{R} \setminus \left(A_\xi \cup \left(\bigcup_{\eta<\xi} X_\eta\right)\right)| = \mathfrak{c}$. Then we may chosse x_ξ and S_ξ which satisfy conditions (1) and (3). Finally, the set X_ξ is defined by (2) and (4) follows from the construction.

Now let define the weak selection f as follows:

$$f(\{r,s\}) = \begin{cases} r & r \in X_\xi \text{ and } s = x_\xi, \text{ for some } \xi < \mathfrak{c}, \\ s & r \in X_\xi \text{ and } s \in S_\xi, \text{ for some } \xi < \mathfrak{c}, \\ f_{\mathfrak{c}}(\{r,s\}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to show that f does not have a minimum. Observe that the weak selection f is well-defined because of (3). Furthermore, $\lambda_f\big(X_\xi\big) = 0$ for every $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$. So $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_f$. To finish the proof we will show that $\mathcal{N}_f \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. In fact, fix $B \in \mathcal{N}_f$ and let $\{(r_n^k, s_n^k]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable family of f-intervals such that

$$B \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n^k, s_n^k]_f \text{ and } \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n^k - r_n^k| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Choose $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ so that $\{r_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{s_n^k : n,k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq X_\xi$. By clause (4), we have that $|X_\xi \setminus \bigcup_{\eta\leq\xi+1} A_\eta| < \mathfrak{c}$ and hence $X_\xi \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus, $B \cap X_\xi \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $B' = B \setminus X_\xi$.

Claim 1: $B' \cap (S_\eta \cup \{x_\eta\}) = \emptyset$ for each ordinal η satisfying $\xi \leq \eta < \mathfrak{c}$.

Proof of Claim 1: Fix $b \in B'$. Since r_n^k, $s_n^k \in X_\xi$, we have that $s <_f r_n^k <_f x_\eta$ and $s <_f s_n^k <_f x_\eta$, for every $k,n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $s \in S_\eta$, where $\xi \leq \eta < \mathfrak{c}$. So $b \notin \bigcup_{\xi\leq\eta}(S_\eta \cup \{x_\eta\})$ because of for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_n^k < b \leq s_n^k$. This shows that $B' \cap (S_\eta \cup \{x_\eta\}) = \emptyset$ for each $\xi \leq \eta < \mathfrak{c}$.

By the definition of f and Claim 1, we obtain that $f(\{b,x\}) = f_{\mathfrak{c}}(\{b,x\})$ for every $b \in B'$ and every $x \in X_\xi$. Then $\lambda_f(B') = \lambda_{f_{\mathfrak{c}}}(B') = 0$ which implies that $B' \in [\mathbb{R}]^{<\mathfrak{c}}$. So $B' \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore, $N_f \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. □

Corollary 3.2. **[MA]** *If $\mathcal{I}$ is a $< \mathfrak{c}$-ideal of $\mathbb{R}$ with $cf(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{c}$, then there is a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{I}$.*

Corollary 3.3. **[MA]** *There exists a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f$ is exactly the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$.*

Question 3.4. *In ZFC, is there a weak selection f such that $\mathcal{N}_f$ is exactly the σ-ideal of meager subsets of $\mathbb{R}$?*

4. Equivalence and congruence of weak selections under their outer measures

In this section, we shall study some conditions on two weak selections f and g in order to induce the same family of measurable sets of $\mathbb{R}$. Indeed, we will call this property $\mathcal{M}$-*equivalence*. The approximation to the $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence property that we propose in the present paper is inspired in Theorem 1.12 from [1], which establishes that if f and g are two weak selections for which there exists $N \in [\mathbb{R}]^\omega$ so that $g\big(\{r,s\}\big) = r$ iff $r <_f s$

when $|\{r,s\}\cap N|\leq 1$, then $\mathcal{M}_f=\mathcal{M}_g$. This property of the weak selections f and g somehow can be formalized in the next definition.

Definition 4.1. Let f and g be two weak selections and let $N\subseteq\mathbb{R}$. We say that f and g are:

(1) *Congruent mod N*, in symbols $f\cong_N g$, if $r<_g s$ iff $r<_f s$ whenever $|\{r,s\}\cap N|\leq 1$.
(2) *Weakly congruent mod N*, in symbols $f\cong^*_N g$, if $r<_g s$ iff $r<_f s$ whenever $\{r,s\}\cap N=\emptyset$.

It is then natural to ask whether or not two weak selections f and g are $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent provide f and g are congruent (weakly congruent) mod N for certain $N\subseteq\mathbb{R}$. In what follows, we will be only interested on weak selections which are weakly congruent mod a countable set. First of all, we shall describe two weak selections f and g such that $f\cong^*_N g$ for a finite set N such that $\mathcal{M}_f\neq\mathcal{M}_g$. To show this we will prove that, for a given fix point $x\in\mathbb{R}$, every weak selection f is weakly congruent mod $\{x\}$ with another weak selection g for which the real line has zero g-outer measure. A usual way to define this kind of outer measures uses Lemma 1.1, but unfortunately this lemma is not strong enough to prove the promised result. Thus we shall need to prove a stronger lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $A\subseteq\mathbb{R}$ and let f be a weak selection. Suppose that there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to x in the Euclidean topology such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|x-x_n|<\infty$$

and

$$A\subseteq\Big(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty}(x,x_n]_f\Big)\cup\Big(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty}(x_n,x]_f\Big),$$

for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Then A has zero f-outer measure.

Proof. Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence converging to x satisfying the required conditions. Fix $\epsilon>0$ arbitrary and let $k\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{n=k}^{\infty}|x-x_n|<\frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By hypothesis,

$$A\subseteq\Big(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty}(x,x_n]_f\Big)\cup\Big(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty}(x_n,x]_f\Big).$$

Then

$$\lambda_f(A)\leq 2\sum_{n=k}^{\infty}|x-x_n|<\epsilon.$$

Since ϵ was chosen arbitrarily we obtain that $\lambda_f(A)=0$. □

Theorem 4.3. *For every weak selection f and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a weak selection g such that $\lambda_g(\mathbb{R}) = 0$ and $g \cong^*_{\{x\}} f$.*

Proof. Fix a weak selection f and choose any point x and a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to x satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |x - x_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $0 < |x - x_n|$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Enumerate the family of all nontrivial subsequences of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ by $\{S_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$. For each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$, define

$$L_\xi = \{r \in \mathbb{R} : r <_f s \text{ for each } s \in S_\xi\},\ R_\xi = \{r \in \mathbb{R} : s <_f r \text{ for each } s \in S_\xi\}$$
$$\text{and}\quad X_\xi = L_\xi \cup R_\xi.$$

The required weak selection g must satisfy that $g|_{[\mathbb{R}\setminus\{x\}]^2} = f|_{[\mathbb{R}\setminus\{x\}]^2}$. Let us see that $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{\xi<\mathfrak{c}} X_\xi$. Indeed, pick $r \in \mathbb{R}$ arbitrary and consider the sets $L = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : r <_f x_n\}$ and $R = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : x_n <_f r\}$. Then we have that at least one of these two sets is infinite. If $|L| = \omega$ and $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ is such that $S_\xi = (x_n)_{n\in L}$, then it is evident that $r \in L_\xi$. A similar conclusion is obtained for the case when R is infinite. We shall define g over $\{\{x, r\} : r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{x\}\}$ since on the other points g will agree with the weak selection f. Fix $r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{x\}$ and let $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ the least ordinal for which $x \in X_\xi$. If $r \in L_\xi$, then we define $x <_g r$, and if $r \in R_\xi$, then we define $r <_g x$. It is clear that g is a well-defined weak selection such that $g \cong^*_{\{x\}} f$. According to Lemma 4.2, we obtain that $\lambda_f(\mathbb{R}) = 0$. □

Corollary 4.4. *For every weak selection f with $\mathcal{P}(X) \neq \mathcal{M}_f$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a weak selection g such that $g \cong^*_{\{x\}} f$ and $\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \neq \mathcal{M}_f$.*

Lemma 4.5. *Let f be a weak selection. Suppose that $X \in [\mathbb{R}]^{\mathfrak{c}}$ satisfies that*

$$|X \setminus \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r_n, s_n]_f| = \mathfrak{c},$$

for every countable family of f-intervals $\{(r_n, s_n]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then X can be partitioned in two disjoint sets each one of them can not be covered for any countable family of f-intervals.

Proof. We shall use transfinite induction to define the required sets. Enumerate $([\mathbb{R}]^2)^\omega$ as $\{\mathcal{S}_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ and each $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ as $\{(r^\xi_n, s^\xi_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Choose x^1_0 and x^2_0 two different points in $X \setminus \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r^0_n, s^0_n]_f$ and suppose that for each $\zeta < \xi$ we have carefully selected two real number

$$x^1_\zeta,\ x^2_\zeta \in X \setminus \big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r^\zeta_n, s^\zeta_n]_f \cup \{x^i_\eta : \eta < \zeta \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}\big).$$

By hypothesis, we have that

$$|X \setminus \big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (r^\xi_n, s^\xi_n]_f \cup \{x^i_\zeta : \zeta < \xi \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}\big)| = \mathfrak{c}.$$

So we may choose two distinct real numbers x^1_ξ and x^2_ξ in this set. This ends with the induction. Now let

$$X_1 = \{x^1_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\} \text{ and } X_2 = X \setminus X_1.$$

It is evident that $\{X_1, X_2\}$ is a partition of X and $\{x^2_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\} \subseteq X_2$. Let $\{(r_n, s_n]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable family of f-intervals and let $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ be such that $r_n = r^\xi_n$ and $s_n = s^\xi_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is then clear that the family $\{(r_n, s_n]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ cannot cover none of the sets X_1 nor X_2 since $\{x^1_\xi, x^2_\xi\} \cap \big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n, s_n]_f\big) = \emptyset$. □

Theorem 4.6. *Let f be a weak selection. Assume that $X \in \mathcal{M}_f$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5. Then for every pair of distinct points a, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a weak selection g such that $f \cong^*_{\{a,b\}} g$, $\lambda(X) = |b-a|$ and $X \notin \mathcal{M}_g$.*

Proof. Suppose that $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ satisfies that $|X \setminus \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n, s_n]_f| = \mathfrak{c}$ for every countable family of f-intervals $\{(r_n, s_n]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let a, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ be distinct with $a < b$. Define g as $a <_g x <_g b$ for every $x \in X$ and $g(\{y, z\}) := f(\{y, z\})$ otherwise. It is evident that $g \cong^*_{\{a,b\}} f$. By Lemma 4.5, there is a partition $\{X_1, X_2\}$ of X so that each one of the sets can not be covered for any countable family of f-intervals. Since the interval $(a, b]_g$ contains the set X, we must have that $\lambda_g(X) \leq b - a$ and hence $\lambda_g(X_1) \leq b - a$ and $\lambda_g(X_2) \leq b - a$. Let $\{(r_n, s_n]_g : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable family of g-intervals. If $(a, b]_g \in \{(r_n, s_n]_g : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |s_n - r_n| \geq b - a.$$

Hence, assume that $(a, b]_g \notin \{(r_n, s_n]_g : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Following the notation from Lemma 4.5, there is $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ such that $r_n = r^\xi_n$ and $s_n = s^\xi_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Besides, we have that either $r^\xi_n \neq a$ or $s^\xi_n \neq b$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand since $x^i_\xi \notin \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r^\xi_n, s^\xi_n]_f$, we have that that either $x^i_\xi <_f r^\xi_n$ or $s^\xi_n <_f x^i_\xi$, for every $i = 1, 2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, we obtain that either $x^i_\xi <_g r^\xi_n$ or $s^\xi_n <_g x^i_\xi$ for every $i = 1, 2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, $x^i_\xi \notin \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r^\xi_n, s^\xi_n]_f$ for every $i = 1, 2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. All these results imply that $\lambda_g(X) = \lambda_g(X_1) = \lambda_g(X_2) = b - a$. As $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, then we obtain that none of the these three sets can be g-measurable. □

Now we turn out our attention to the weak selection $f_\mathfrak{c}$, where $\leq_{f_\mathfrak{c}}$ is order isomorphic to the order of $\mathfrak{c}$. Observe that, since $\mathcal{M}_{f_\mathfrak{c}} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, we can not apply Corollary **??** to find a weak selection g such that $g \cong^*_N f_\mathfrak{c}$, for some $N \in [\mathbb{R}]^\omega$, and $\mathcal{M}_g \neq \mathcal{M}_{f_\mathfrak{c}}$. We will see in the next theorem that, in general, Corollary **??** could fail if we do not require the condition $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{M}_f \neq \emptyset$ by showing that every weak selection g, weakly congruent mod a countable set with $f_\mathfrak{c}$ satisfy that $\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. To prove it we need two lemmas.

Lemma 4.7. *Let f a weak selection such that $\lambda_f\big((r, s]_f\big) = 0$ for every $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathcal{M}_f = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda_f(X) \in \{0, +\infty\}$ for each $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Of course if X can not be cover by a countable cover of f-intervals, then $\lambda_f(X) = +\infty$ and so $X \in \mathcal{M}_f$. Assume that there exists a

countable family $\{(r_n, s_n]_f : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $X \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(r_n, s_n]_f$. Then

$$\lambda_f(X) \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \lambda_f\big((r_n, s_n]_f\big) = 0.$$

Of course, in this case, we also obtain that $X \in \mathcal{M}_f$. □

Theorem 4.8. *For every ordinal number α of cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$, and for every bijection $\phi : [0, \alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$, we have that $\mathcal{M}_{f_\phi} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathfrak{c} \leq \alpha < \mathfrak{c}^+$ and fix a bijection $\phi : [0, \alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$. We will prove by transfinite induction that $(\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi} \in \mathcal{N}_{f_\phi}$ for every ordinal ξ with $0 < \xi < \alpha$. First observe that $|(\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}| < \mathfrak{c}$ for all $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$. Hence, we can find a sequence S which converges to $\phi(0)$ such that $S \cap (\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi} = \emptyset$ and $\phi(\xi) <_{f_\phi} s$ for all $s \in S$. So, by Lemma 1.1, $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. Thus we may assume that $\mathfrak{c} \leq \xi < \alpha$ and $(\phi(0), \phi(\eta)]_{f_\phi} \in \mathcal{N}_{f_\phi}$ for every $\eta < \xi$. If $\xi = \eta + 1$, then the assertion follows directly from the inductive hypothesis because of $(\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi} = (\phi(0), \phi(\eta)]_{f_\phi} \cup \{\phi(\xi)\}$. Now, assume that ξ is a limit ordinal. We need to consider two cases:

Case I: $cf(\xi) = \omega$. Let $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a strictly sequence of ordinals such that $\eta_n \nearrow \xi$. Then,

$$(\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi} = \big(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (\phi(0), \phi(\eta_n)]_{f_\phi}\big) \cup \{\phi(\xi)\}.$$

So, the inductive hypothesis implies that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$.

Case II: $cf(\xi) > \omega$. Suppose that $[\phi(\xi), \phi(\alpha))_{f_\phi}$ is not a closed set in the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}$. Then there are an ordinal number $\eta < \xi$ and a sequence of ordinals $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, with $\xi \leq \eta_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that the sequence $(\phi(\eta_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\phi(\eta)$ in the Euclidean topology. By Lemma 1.1, we have that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(\eta), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. Since the inductive hypothesis guarantees that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\eta)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$, we obtain that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. Hence, we can suppose that $[\phi(\xi), \phi(\alpha))_{f_\phi}$ is a closed set in the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}$. So, $(\phi(0), \phi(\xi))_{f_\phi}$ is an open set in the Euclidean topology. Let $\eta \geq \xi$ such that $\phi(\eta)$ is an accumulation point, in the Euclidean topology, of $(\phi(0), \phi(\xi))_{f_\phi}$. Then, choose a sequence of ordinals $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the interval $(0, \xi)$ so that $(\phi(\eta_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\phi(\eta)$ in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\eta = sup\{\eta_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Since $cf(\xi) > \omega$, we have that $\eta < \xi$. Then, by Lemma 1.1, we have that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big([\phi(\eta), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. By assumption we know that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\eta)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. Thus, we finally obtain that $\lambda_{f_\phi}\big((\phi(0), \phi(\xi)]_{f_\phi}\big) = 0$. According to Lemma 4.7, $\mathcal{M}_{f_\phi} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. □

Theorem 4.8 provides an infinite family of distinct weak selections which are pairwise $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent. In particular, if f is the weak selection defined in [1, Ex. 3.6], then $\lambda_f\big((r, s]_f\big) = \lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}\big((r, s]_f\big) = 0$, for every $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$, but $\lambda_f \neq \lambda_{f_\mathfrak{c}}$ (this answers negatively Question 3.14 of [1]).

We are convinced that the particular problem of find weak selections which are $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent to f_E seems to be very interesting. Somehow related to this, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let f and g be two weak selection such that $f \cong_A g$. Then*

(1) *$(r,s]_f \setminus A = (r,s]_g \setminus A$, for every $r,\ s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(r,s]_f = (r,s]_g$, for every $r,\ s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus A$; and*
(2) *$\lambda_f(X \setminus A) = \lambda_g(X \setminus A)$ for every $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_f(X \setminus A) < \infty$.*

Proof. By definition, statement (1) follows directly from the fact that $r <_f x <_f s$ iff $r <_g x <_g s$, for every $r,\ s \in \mathbb{R}$ and for each $x \notin A$. To prove (2) let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $\lambda_f(X \setminus A) < \infty$. Consider an arbitrary $\mathcal{C} = \big\{\{a_n, b_n\} : n,\ m \in \mathbb{N}\big\} \subseteq [\mathbb{R}]^2$. Observe from clause (1) that

$$X \setminus A \subseteq \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} (a_n, b_n]_f \Leftrightarrow X \setminus A \subseteq \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \big((a_n, b_n]_f \setminus A\big)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow X \setminus A \subseteq \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \big((a_n, b_n]_g \setminus A\big) \Leftrightarrow X \setminus A \subseteq \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} (a_n, b_n]_g.$$

By hypothesis there exists a countable family of f-intervals of X which witnesses that $\lambda_f(X \setminus A) < \infty$. Following the observation we have that $\lambda_g(X \setminus A) \leq \lambda_f(X \setminus A) < \infty$. Again, by the same observation, $\lambda_f(X \setminus A) \leq \lambda_g(X \setminus A)$. Therefore, $\lambda_f(X \setminus A) = \lambda_g(X \setminus A)$. □

Question 4.10. *It is true that two weak selections f and g are $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent provide $f \cong_N g$ for some $N \in \mathcal{N}_f \cap \mathcal{N}_g$?*

References

[1] J. A. Astorga-Moreno y S. Garcia-Ferreira, *Outer measures on the real line by weak selections*, Real Anal. Exchange **39** (2014), 101–116.
[2] C. Costantini, *Weak orderability of some spaces which admit a weak selection*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **47** (2006), 609–615.
[3] S. Garcia-Ferreira y A. H. Tomita, *A non-normal topology generated by a two-point selection*, Top. Appl. **155** (2008), 1105 – 1110.
[4] S. Garcia-Ferreira, K. Miyazaki and T. Nogura, *Continuous weak selections for products*, Top. Appl., Topology Appl. 160 (2013), 2465–2472.
[5] S. Garcia-Ferreira, K. Miyazaki, T. Nogura y A. H. Tomita, *Topologies generated by weak selection topologies*, Houston J. Math. 39 (2013), 1385– 1399.
[6] V. Gutev and T. Nogura, *Selections and order-like selections*, Appl. Gen. Top. **2** (2001), 205–218.
[7] V. Gutev and T. Nogura, *A topology generated by selections*, Top. Appl. **153** (2004), 900–911.
[8] M. Hrusák and I. Martinez-Ruíz, *Selections and weak orderability*, Fund. Math. **203** (2009), 1–20.
[9] M. Hrusák and I. Martinez-Ruíz, *Spaces determined by selections*, Top. Appl. **157** (2010), 1448 – 1453.
[10] M. Nagao and D. Shakhmatov, *On the existe.n.c.e of kings in continuous tournaments*, Top. Appl. **159** (2012), 3089 – 3096.

Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Campus Morelia, Apartado Postal 61-3, Santa Maria, 58089, Morelia, Michoacán, México
E-mail address: sgarcia@matmor.unam.mx

Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão, 1010, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo, Brazil
E-mail address: tomita@ime.usp.br

Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão, 1010, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo, Brazil
E-mail address: jazzerfoc@gmail.com